

# COMMON GROUND



# The Council of Christians and Jews

PATRON: HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

## OBJECTS

To combat all forms of religious and racial intolerance. To promote mutual understanding and goodwill between Christians and Jews, and to foster co-operation in educational activities and in social and community service.

### *Presidents*

HIS GRACE THE LORD ARCHBISHOP  
OF CANTERBURY

THE RT. REV. THE MODERATOR OF  
THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

THE RT. REV. THE MODERATOR OF  
THE FREE CHURCH FEDERAL COUNCIL

THE VERY REV. THE CHIEF RABBI

### *Vice-Presidents*

THE RT. HON. LORD COHEN      SIR RICHARD LIVINGSTONE

### *Hon. Treasurer*

EDMUND DE ROTHSCHILD, T.D.

### *Joint Hon. Secretaries*

PERCY W. BARTLETT      A. G. BROTMAN, B.SC.

### *Chairman of Executive Committee*

THE REV. CHARLES E. RAVEN, D.D., F.B.A.

### *General Secretary*

THE REV. W. W. SIMPSON, M.A.

### *Organising Secretary*

D. WALLACE BELL

### *Education Officer*

A. I. POLACK, M.A.

## LOCAL COUNCILS

Birmingham, Brighton, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, Chester, Hampstead, Hull, Ilford, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, Middlesbrough, Oxford, Southport, South Shields, Sunderland, Willesden.

KINGSWAY CHAMBERS · 162A STRAND · LONDON · WC2

TELEPHONE: TEMPLE BAR 9306-7-8

---

## Cover Photograph

Boscastle Harbour

(Photo: Reece Winstone)

# COMMON GROUND

VOLUME X NUMBER 6

NOVEMBER-DECEMBER 1956

---

## MAIN CONTENTS

Toleration in British History	- - - - -	Herbert Butterfield
From Toleration to Understanding	- - - - -	A. I. Polack
Some outstanding figures of Anglo-Jewry	- - - - -	Sidney Salomon

*Signed articles express the views of the contributors which are not necessarily those of the Council of Christians and Jews.*

---

## Toleration in British History

HERBERT BUTTERFIELD

*"Common Ground" is glad to be able to print a summary of the Third Robert Waley Cohen Memorial Lecture by Professor Herbert Butterfield. The full text of the Lecture will shortly be available, published by the Epworth Press.*

WE OFTEN MAKE mistakes in history because we look at it backwards and see things in reverse instead of watching it on the forward move. If we are to see the history of toleration in its proper framework we must go back to that earlier stage in man's religious life when a whole society showed its solidarity in its cult, religion being a corporate thing, the bond of the tribe closely connected with the mundane welfare of the people. As its internal or spiritual aspect becomes more important, religion necessarily finds its basis rather in the individual than in the political society, and the stress rather on the fact that God dwells in the inner recesses of a human being, the Law being written on man's heart.

The Jewish exile provides a classic case of this transition, for when the solidarity of the body politic had been broken and the Temple at Jerusalem had been destroyed, there emerged the concept of a New Covenant, a new teaching, proclaimed by prophets whose emphasis was on the importance of the individual and his own spiritual life. The notion of freedom of conscience could only arise after this development had taken place. This whole development is in fact a fundamental condition of the rise of modern individualism.

Only because religion was seen as so momentous a matter and each individual was seen as having his own separate wire to eternity, could there be any ground for a conception of duty and conscience which could over-ride the pressure of custom, the demands of family, the claims of mundane society and the power of the state.

### **Religion by conquest**

In both Judaism and Christianity, however, it has been proved possible for a retrogression to take place. After the fate of the Roman Empire a barbarian Europe was Christianised to a considerable degree by a process of mass conversion, by military conquest, social pressure and Governmental decree. Amongst barbarian peoples, this may have been the only thing that could happen, but the process was not entirely unlike that by which another great section of the globe was to become Mohammedan or by which a great part of modern Europe and Asia have been brought over to Communism. However high you may place the virtue of intellectual humility, most of us, I think, would find it difficult to consent to a situation in which one quarter of the globe is permanently Christian because it never questions the faith of its fathers, while another quarter is permanently Moslem because it, too, refuses to criticise the ancestral tradition. If the Reformation had never happened, Western Europe might have had more peace and unity in the last five or six centuries, but I am not sure that this would not have meant the stillness of death, the rigidity and torpor that we associate with some of the long standing oriental systems. One's view on this whole issue depends on whether one believes that in the development of civilisation there is a process which leads to greater differentiation in individuals, greater autonomy and responsibility—indeed, a higher form of personality.

### **Deadlock**

The leaders of the Reformation, however, were not fighting for individual liberty but for the establishment of right religion in the world, at a time when God was no mere hypothesis and hell was no mere speculation, so that the establishment of the right religion seemed to be the most momentous thing in life. These reforming leaders did not capture Christendom; they only half succeeded; and the cause of liberty owes as much to their failure as to their success. The resulting deadlock meant that the world was confronted by

the tremendous problem of two exclusive religions, each claiming to be absolute and necessary to salvation, each regarding the other as a diabolical perversion and blasphemy. As in the case of the conflict between the liberal half of the world and the Communist half of the world at the present day, it seemed that the doctrines could never meet, the parties could never compromise, the systems were mutually exclusive and neither could ever rest until it had annihilated the other.

Here was the absolute logical *impasse*—for nobody could imagine the possibility of co-existence for two exclusive religions—especially co-existence within a simple nation or society. So there occurred some of the bitterest warfare in modern history; and in the interlude between such conflicts there existed the unrelenting, increasing “cold war.” It was the extreme case of ideological warfare and “wars for righteousness,” embodying many of the phenomena with which we are familiar today, Fifth Columnists, Collaborationists etc. It required a creative act to discover the way round this terrible *impasse*. It required changes in many things besides Catholicism and Protestantism, changes perhaps in one’s view of the rôle of religion in society, changes in one’s conception of society itself, changes in one’s notion of the place of the individual in society.

### Rise of the sects

In the hands of the great Reformers, the Reformation itself did not lead to religious liberty. It led rather to the principle of *cuius regio eius religio*—for since neither party could establish itself universally, Governments and princes could not be subjected to any higher control. The older conception of the solidarity of the state as a religious society was perhaps even hardened, because now the authority was exercised not by a distant Pope, but by a powerful Government near at hand.

Modern religious liberty emerges in fact not from the quarrel between Protestant and Catholic, but much more from the quarrel between Protestant and Protestant. Martin Luther unintentionally released a force which he was unable to master and which he hated more perhaps than he hated Catholicism. He opened the way for the rise of the sects. If Luther had stood alone, he might have been counted an aberration; but when so many other people brought out the results of their broodings over the scriptures and their spiritual experience, it became apparent that a new stage had been reached



in the development of Christendom. Mere abuses in a church can always be met by concrete reforms. But the great Reformation occurred not merely because of abuses but because for centuries the Catholic Church had done its work so well, bringing religion home to the individual, making men realise their responsibility, and developing them to a stage of higher maturity.

During the reign of Charles I the religious conflict in England was a struggle not between the upholders of liberty and the agents of intolerance, but between two views of what the monopoly of religion ought to be. The upholders of the Presbyterian system and the upholders of the Episcopalian might each claim freedom of conscience when the other was in power. This minority claim for freedom of conscience was not new in Christian history; the trouble was that, when you attained power you did not admit that the other party represented a valid case for freedom of conscience—you regarded it as representing perversion and blasphemy. In the reign of Elizabeth there had been some kind of attempt to deal with the problem of religious dissidence by a policy of comprehension, which might make the notion of the state as a religious society more flexible, embracing many lovers of the old and many lovers of the new. When the conflict was between Laudianism and Presbyterianism, however, both parties were fighting for a more exclusive system.

#### **Cromwell's influence**

By 1649 it had been practically decided that the defeat of Charles I was not to result in the establishment of the entire Presbyterian system in England. The rise of the sects, which was the reason for this, must be regarded particularly in England, as a great moment in the history of religion. The duel between King and Parliament had given the strategic position to the Army. The duel between Episcopalianism and Presbyterianism had given the opportunity for the rise of the sects. It was to prove important that the sects gained predominance in the Army, and that after his victory at the battle of Naseby, Cromwell's influence became more and more important—an influence exercised on behalf of the Independents. Paradoxically, it was the victory of the Army, and its high-handed refusal to obey the Long Parliament, which made the period of the Commonwealth so important a chapter in the history of religious liberty.

The sects themselves, however, were prone to be intolerant and fanatical. Once the threat of Presbyterianism was removed, they

tended to lose the solidarity they had had with one another. There was always some party that they wanted to exclude from toleration. Some became so afraid of the extremist parties which had emerged that they reverted to a more conservative outlook themselves. It was really Cromwell who wanted to grant toleration to all who feared God provided they did not produce any civil disturbances or conspire against the Government.

### **Dangers of extremism**

Some of the sects wanted to secure the monopoly for their own extremist systems, however, and were prepared to work for the overthrow of the whole régime, so that Cromwell had to take action against them. Some of the more orthodox felt that the door was left open to extremists; they wanted Parliament to define what doctrines should be held to be blasphemous, and Cromwell had a great duel with Parliament itself for the purpose of maintaining the right to veto legislation that might limit the religious liberty granted by the instrument of Government.

Anglicanism was specifically excluded from the grant of toleration, but in fact the use of the Book of Common Prayer was not entirely suppressed and there was no great outcry for liberty to use the Book—Anglicanism was repressed because it gave a focus to royalist intrigue. Though Cromwell regarded Roman Catholicism as associated with practices which he held to be idolatrous, even here the generosity of his policy was sometimes wider than his own actual belief would have warranted. The Roman Catholics were better treated than under previous Parliaments, and he did what he could to save them from the intolerance of the nation. Quakers were very unpopular in the country in the early stages of their development; the J.P.s treated them severely; the higher courts were less severe; but it was Cromwell who saw some point in them and wanted to avoid repression as much as possible. In fact the situation between 1650 and 1656, though it was soon to be overthrown, enabled Nonconformity to root itself in English life, and had a permanent effect on the problem of religious liberty.

### **Tolerance from conviction**

The important transition comes when people are not merely asserting their own rights (which is a thing almost as old as history) but when men who believe one thing begin to show anxiety to defend



## WILLIAM PENN AT THE QUAKERS' SYNOD

### *A contemporary caricature*



the right of conscience for people of different beliefs. We see this in the period of the Commonwealth, and particularly in Cromwell, who seeks toleration not out of religious indifference, but because he sees religion as so momentous a matter that it must not be imposed by the state or by one man on another—the conscience of the other man has to be respected. And Cromwell sees that the law of charity demands this respect for the other man's personality. During the Commonwealth some people demanded liberty even for those who did not believe in the divinity of Christ, while others regarded this as too serious a blasphemy. Here again Cromwell seems to have shown greater charity in practice than his formal views permitted. It has been said of him that perhaps he made a mistake in insisting on going further in toleration generally than the bulk of the nation could agree to.

In 1652 the cry went up that toleration should not be restricted to Christians, and that it was even contrary to Scripture to exclude the Jews from its benefits. The Jews in Holland made application for admission, but when a committee sat upon the matter in 1655 the Christians were too hostile and the merchants were afraid of the economic competition. Cromwell was told by two of his judges that in reality there was no law forbidding the Jews to return to England. And though there already were some Jews living quietly in London it is from 1656 that we really date their readmission. From this time those who were in London ceased to pretend to be Spaniards (which was a disadvantage when England went to war with Spain) and they possessed not merely a Synagogue but also their own cemetery.

### **Re-admission of Jews**

In spite of the promise which all this seemed to offer, the Restoration of 1660 was accompanied by a further attempt to reconstitute England as a uniform religious society; but the deeper effects of the Commonwealth could not be undone, and henceforward there existed a Nonconformity which might combine with Anglicanism against Roman Catholicism or even join with the Roman Catholics in demanding toleration. The Revolution of 1688, the elevation of the Prince of Orange and the Catholicism of the displaced James II decided the issue in favour of toleration for those who were Protestant; though in the typical English way, the statutes against the dissenters were not repealed, and it was merely decreed that they should not be put into operation. By this time also, the rise of more

secular ideas enabled people to view religion with greater relativity. Perhaps it is true to say that if the toleration of the 1650s produced an anarchy of religious sects, toleration in 1689 either produced or accompanied a great degree of religious indifference.

One of the remarkable features of the history of toleration in England—though the story in England is happier than that of some other countries—is the number of centuries that it takes to achieve full liberty, the extraordinary tenacity of irrational religious prejudice. Another feature, not unconnected with this, is the extraordinary difficulty of converting the wider masses of the population to liberal views. Strong leadership was always required, and Cromwell was not the only leader who was held in check by a passionate uneducated public opinion. Particularly astonishing is the depth of the anti-popery complex in modern English history. The fact that politics and religion had been so intertwined made Catholicism appear to the Englishman as a sinister mundane menace. At the time of the Gordon Riots in 1780 it would almost seem that the governing classes of the country, who combined to such a degree to relax the severities against Catholics, had moved so far forward that they were out of touch with the passions and prejudices of the masses.

#### **Liberty can be lost**

Even in the limited field within which toleration was established in 1689, a new problem quickly emerged, for toleration itself is an imperfect concession, implying that one religion is right but that the aberrations will be allowed to exist on sufferance. A country may allow toleration within a given area in order that the consciences of men may not have to be violated; but the ideal of England as a uniform religious society dies hard. Nonconformists could not expect to be admitted into governing circles of the country, nor claim a political voice which they would only use in order to disrupt the religious establishment. It was in Christian history that there emerged the policy which we have known only too well in the twentieth century—the reduction of a dissentient part of the population to the position of second-class citizens. Those who were responsible for this had their ideal of the state as a religious society, an ideal, which though it had its place at an earlier stage in the world's development, is in fact inseparable from a persecuting policy. If the state is a corporate person and religion is the affair

of the compound body in its entirety, not only do politico-religious perversities arise, but there is no foothold for the rights of the dissentient individual. And liberty, though it can be lost in a moment, even in a moment of absence of mind, only comes to the world by virtue of a creative achievement and by a process which it takes centuries to complete.

## From Toleration to Understanding

A. I. POLACK

### Three hundred years of Jewish-Christian relations

**T**O TOLERATE is to put up with something you dislike. If the wireless is constantly booming from the flat upstairs or if your neighbour's dog is in the habit of trampling on your flower beds, you may learn to tolerate these things for the sake of good social relations, but you will never like them or cease to regard them as "intolerable." A popular word for this kind of toleration today is coexistence and it implies an attitude of forbearance towards a group or groups of people whom you heartily dislike but refrain from attacking for the sake of a greater good, such as world peace.

Understanding is a much more forthright term and implies a certain spiritual energy. It is not in this sense an easily acquired virtue but comes primarily to those who have a broad human outlook and are readily moved to compassion, who, to use Terence's phrase, "consider everything human as having a claim on their sympathies." One of the morning prayers in the Hebrew Prayer Book runs: "O favour us with knowledge, understanding and discernment from thee." It does not pray for toleration.

When the Marrano Jews in this country first emerged from their concealment three hundred years ago and a trickle of foreign Jews began to settle here, they may have been tolerated by the Christian majority but there was little attempt at understanding. And the same holds true for at least 150 years after the resettlement. During all this period the Church was apt to look upon them with the utmost suspicion as a dangerous and "blasphemous" group who sought to pervert the nation. Their return was advocated largely for conversionist, or commercial, purposes and only by a

slow and painful process did they gradually acquire the status of a recognised, independent religious community. In fact, the three hundred years of Christian-Jewish history since the resettlement may be described as the period of advance from toleration to understanding.

But the context of these events is not a specifically Jewish-Christian one. Society in post-Reformation England developed a certain cultural pluralism and it was no longer a scene in which two homogeneous groups, the Jews and the Church, confronted each other in a vacuum. Splinter religious groups of all kinds had grown up in this country and the history of the Anglo-Jewish community cannot be treated in isolation. Its fate was constantly bound up with the attitude adopted by Parliament and the established Church towards other dissenting bodies such as the Roman Catholics or the Quakers.

### **Messianic hopes**

Indeed, it was largely through non-conforming groups that the Jews came to be thought of at all. It is true that an interest in them had arisen in Tudor times as a result of the Reformation but this at first had little relation to living Jewish people, though Henry VIII did actually send an emissary to consult a learned Jewish rabbi in Venice about the legality of his marriage with his brother's widow. The first practical steps in regard to a possible return were taken by those Puritan sects whose combined influence had caused the overthrow of the monarchy and the establishment of the Commonwealth. Such were the Levellers and the New Covenanters who thought that the millennium would only come about when Jews were to be found living among all the nations of the world. The Levellers, indeed, called themselves metaphorically "Jews" and their enemies "Amalekites." Another group, the Fifth Monarchy men, held, concurrently with the Jewish Cabbalists, who had been much influenced by the Zohar, written in the 14th century, that the Messianic age was, so to speak, only just round the corner.

It was this coincidence of thought in current Judaism and Christianity that actually turned Menasseh ben Israel's mind to England. For he had struck up a friendship in Amsterdam with an English theologian called John Durie who wrote him a letter concerning the lost ten tribes. At about the same time Joanna and Ebenezer Cartwright, English Baptists living in Holland, sent a petition to General Fairfax in favour of Jewish readmission.



#### MENASSEH BEN ISRAEL BEFORE CROMWELL

*By Solomon Hart*

*(From the collection of A. Rubens Esq)*

These and similar events led to the negotiations with Cromwell, too well known to be recapitulated here, which, though they appeared to have failed, actually paved the way for the famous declaration that there was no legal impediment to a readmission of the Jews to England.

The religious motive, though it was not the only one, thus played a decisive part in the resettlement. But it cannot be claimed that it led to any immediate growth of understanding or spiritual kinship between the two communities. Where Jews were concerned sufferance was still "the badge of all their tribe" and they, in their turn, must have thought of Christians with memories of the Inquisition fresh in their minds and a sense of constant fear, refuelled from time to time by the publication of tracts which contained the usual blood libels and similar calumnies. Yet one beneficent effect came, paradoxically enough, from Menasseh's failure to secure a separate legal status for the Jews in England. They were never forced to live in a ghetto, as in other European countries. This meant that there was a



certain amount of social mixing with their Christian neighbours from the start. The latter not only did business with them but could see their synagogues—the first in 1556 was a rented house in Creechurch Lane—and their cemeteries which were open to the public view. It is almost certain, too, that had there been a law passed by the Commonwealth establishing them as a protected community it would have been revoked by the Parliament of the Restoration.

Nevertheless a long time elapsed before there was anything in the nature of a healthy relationship between the Jews and the general community. Through a series of somewhat fortuitous decisions, such as that concerning the famous Robles case, their legal position was indeed gradually secured. But in other respects they shared the hostility felt for all non-conforming groups during the later Stuart period. They were, it is true, exempted through the protection of the Stuart kings from the disabilities suffered by non-conformists in general as a result of the Conventicle Act, the Act of Uniformity and the Test Act. But they had special troubles of their own. During the whole of this early period and indeed until comparatively modern times they had as a rule to face the hostility and conversionist activities of the established Church. Though never actively persecuted they were in fact regarded by most Christians with the utmost suspicion as a potential danger to the whole of Christendom.

#### **Hostile reactions**

A good instance of the general attitude towards them at this time is furnished by the incident of the Dutch Jewess, Eva Cohen, who ran away to England with one of her father's former employees and became converted to Christianity. An attempt was made by her relatives to have her legally arrested and restored to her home. The then Lord Mayor of London threatened to proceed against the whole Jewish sect for offering "such an affront to the nation and religion of the land." A little later, in 1680, the Bishop of Lincoln and others drew up a scheme whereby the entire Jewish community should be segregated on pre-Expulsion lines. Fortunately it was rejected by the Privy Council. In their ordinary social life, too, they were constantly subjected to unfair treatment and petty indignities. If they secured proselytes they were liable to criminal prosecution while they were forced "to maintain and provide for their Protestant children." They were accused from time to time

of murdering any members of their families who had married outside the community. Sometimes they were elected to the office of churchwarden and heavily fined when they refused to serve. This was one of the methods by which the parish augmented its funds !

### **Christian understanding**

Yet there were signs even in these early days of a more humane approach to the Jews on the part of their Christian neighbours. We know that when Bevis Marks Synagogue was built (1699-1702) the contractor, Joseph Avis, a Quaker, refused to make a profit on what he regarded as a holy task. We hear, also, of occasional visits on the part of Christians (such as Samuel Pepys) to synagogue services. And the story of the famous "Jew Bill" (1753) shows that the leaders of the Church themselves were beginning to adopt a less hostile attitude. This contained proposals for the naturalisation of foreign Jews and was violently attacked, up and down the country. Yet the spiritual peers supported the Bill when it came up before the House of Lords though they were accused of "delivering the Keys of the Church to those who had murdered their Saviour."

These small beginnings led to a much more marked growth of understanding on the part of the Christian churches at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries. This was largely due to the Evangelical movement which laid so much emphasis on the social aspect of religion and appealed straight to the hearts of the masses in terms of human service and brotherhood. It is true that, where the Jews were concerned, the awakened interest led in the first instance to even greater conversionist activity. Yet they were no longer regarded as an exotic, unregenerate sect, scorned and ridiculed by the "true believers," but as descendants of the ancient people of God, to whom Christians owed a part of their religious heritage. The changed outlook can be seen in the literature to which the Evangelical movement gave rise, in such a novel, for instance, as George Eliot's *Daniel Deronda*, in the foundation of a "pro-Jewish society" in 1827, which was free from conversionist aims, and in an attempt to identify the English nation with the Lost Ten Tribes.

### **Integration and equality**

The general movement, too, for the emancipation of non-conforming minorities owed much of its inspiration to these stirrings of conscience. Its impact on British life and thought has, indeed,

lasted right up to the present day. It is true that in some countries Jews gained full legal rights and status earlier than in England, but this was because the local Jewish community had become so happily integrated into English social life that they did not feel the necessity of agitating for equality on a statutory basis. In the course of the nineteenth century, however, they, together with the other non-conforming groups, acquired full citizen rights—the right to vote, to sit in Parliament, to take a university degree, etc.—and became as they are today, indistinguishable before the law from their fellow-citizens of other creeds.

All this affords proof—if proof is needed—of British toleration and taken in relation to the experience of Jews in other parts of the world established the claim that the people of this country have shown an unparalleled spirit of fairness and liberality. This fact is important to realise as in many parts of the world English people have a reputation for insularity and xenophobia, and a recent immigrant who had travelled extensively in Europe was heard to say that "England was the only country where it was a crime to be a foreigner." If, as a people, we "don't like foreigners" we have certainly acquired a remarkable aptitude for concealing the fact; for they have migrated to these shores in many waves during the past 300 years, have been made to feel at home here and integrated into the national life. Between 1850 and 1950 the Jewish community in this country rose from 35,000 to something like 450,000. The influx consisted of foreign refugees who came from a totally different cultural background and were entirely ignorant of the English language and the English way of life. Yet the whole process was carried out without anything in the nature of a social upheaval or any perceptible disturbance in the national harmony.

### **Call for co-operation**

Is this, then, the end of the story? Has the battle for humane treatment of man by man, for the recognition of the principle of diversity, the complete acceptance of human beings as such without consideration of race, colour, class or creed been won as far as this country is concerned?

At the beginning of this article the point was made that there is a distinction between mere toleration and that understanding which is based on knowledge and wide human sympathy. The former was gradually achieved during the past 300 years when Jews and other

non-conforming groups gained complete emancipation and the right of entry into every sphere of the national life. But only a rash man would assert that we have yet attained to the ideal in social behaviour represented by the latter; for this would mean that suspicion, prejudice and intolerance have ceased to play any part in our attitudes towards people and groups who are unlike ourselves.

And this is where co-operation between Christians and Jews has still a vital role to play. Three hundred years ago there came to a Jewish Rabbi the dream that the House of Israel might once more share in the life of the British people. He found the readiest response in the hearts of a few Christian idealists who were thinking in Messianic terms and who realised the essential role of the people of the Book in the advent of God's kingdom on earth. Now, three hundred years later, these two religious groups have come together on the basis of a more positive relationship in response to the challenge of their times. For they have come to realise that the problem of man's intolerance to man cannot be solved on the mere principle of coexistence, of living and letting live. Toleration must give way to understanding and that is why Christians and Jews are learning to co-operate in a national movement which seeks first a "reconciliation" (to quote Dr. Fisher's phrase) among themselves and then through that example to promote understanding between people of every religious and racial group. On the success of this and kindred movements of the spirit the happiness of human beings must ultimately depend.

**ONE GOD—THE WAYS HE IS WORSHIPPED  
AND SERVED**

*A series of four filmstrips depicting the Anglican, Roman Catholic, Free Church and Jewish Ways, prepared with the approval of the National Society of the Church of England, the Roman Catholic Church authorities, the Free Church Federal Council, and the Very Reverend the Chief Rabbi.*

Price for complete set, including full lecture notes : 24s. 0d. (Postage and packing 6d.)

**THE COUNCIL OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS**  
Kingsway Chambers, 162a Strand, London, W.C.2

## Some outstanding figures of Anglo-Jewry

SIDNEY SALOMON

*When one surveys the part played by British Jewry in the general cultural life of England during the past three hundred years, one realises the contribution which the Community, less than one per cent of the general population, has made. This article makes no claim to completeness. It does no more than indicate some outstanding names in education and charitable endeavour in spheres outside the Community. The author is Press and Publications Officer of the Board of Deputies of British Jews.*

TWO THREADS are visible throughout the pattern of Jewish life, the importance attached to learning in its widest connotation, and devotion to the practice of charity. Within a few years of the resettlement, in 1664, the small community set up a school for boys and established a Study Circle. Antonio Carvajal, "the first English Jew," by his bequest of £10 on his death in 1659 to the Church of St. Katherine Cree, was the first of a long line of Jewish philanthropists and benefactors to charitable causes outside the Community.

Though this article is confined to activities outside the Community, there is good reason for referring to the Jews' Free School, because among its pupils were many who became prominent in public life. Among them was Selig Brodetsky (d. 1954) not only a prominent figure in the Zionist Movement, but a distinguished mathematician and astronomer, and author of one of the best lives of Isaac Newton, and its staff included Israel Zangwill and S. M. Rich, for many years Secretary of the Charles Lamb Society. The moving spirit of this great school was Moses Angel, Headmaster (1842-1897) under whom the school became the largest and one of the best known in the British Empire. Moses Angel was among the first generation of Jewish students of University College, London. He was also for a time the Editor of the *Jewish Chronicle*. He ruled the school with an iron hand under a velvet glove, and must be numbered, undoubtedly among the great educationalists of the 19th century. He was not only a teacher of children, he was a teacher of teachers. Members of his staff became Headmasters of practically every Jewish school throughout Great Britain.

To proceed to the next stage in education, the University. It was not until 1871 that University Tests were finally abolished at the



ancient Universities. It was to meet this difficulty for those who could not conform, that University College London was founded in 1821 to blossom, in 1837, into London University. Among the founders were several Jews, including, notably, members of the Goldsmid family, the Rothschilds of the 18th century, who after a temporary eclipse, became once more prominent in public life.

### Scientists

The first Jew to enter Cambridge was James Joseph Sylvester (1814-1897) whose outstanding mathematical ability was shown by his becoming Second Wrangler in 1837, and two years later, a Fellow of the Royal Society. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that today there are 30 Jewish members of that distinguished body. Sylvester, after holding Chairs at several Colleges both in England and in the U.S.A., became Savilian Professor of Geometry at Oxford. His name is commemorated by the Sylvester Medal founded by the Royal Society.

Another distinguished scientist was Raphael Meldola (1849-1915) Professor of Chemistry at Finsbury College. Among his various attainments was that of being a distinguished entomologist and the discoverer of coal tar dyes. He was the grandson of a Chief Rabbi of the Spanish and Portuguese Community, and in 1913 was awarded the Davy Medal given annually for the most important discovery in Chemistry.

### And lawyers

Another early Jewish member of Cambridge University was Arthur Cohen (1829-1914) a scion of one of the most distinguished of Anglo-Jewish families whose members include Lord Cohen as well as the late Sir Robert Waley Cohen. He entered Cambridge in 1849, was President of the Union and Fifth Wrangler. Going to the Bar he rose to become one of its greatest leaders, and was described by Professor A. V. Dicey as the *beau ideal* of an English lawyer. He was Standing Counsel for the India Office and for Cambridge University, and his status at the Bar was shown by his appointment as a member of the Privy Council.

The first Jew to be Senior Wrangler was Numa Hartog in 1870, but he died in the following year, three days before the Act which finally abolished University Tests which would have enabled him to take up a Fellowship at Trinity College. He was a brilliant member

of a brilliant family which included Sir Philip Hartog (d. 1947), an authority on educational administration, and first Vice-Chancellor of the Indian University of Dacca.

Since those early days, many Chairs and other posts at Universities, both ancient and "red-brick," have been filled by Jews, many of them of the highest distinction, including a number of exiles from Nazi Germany.

Among the most eminent of Jewish scholars was the Australian born Samuel Alexander, (1859-1938) for 30 years Professor of Philosophy at the University of Manchester. His great work *Space, Time and Deity* established his place among great thinkers, and he was the first, and so far the only, Jew to be awarded the Order of Merit. His private character, his austerity of life, combined with his kindheartedness, made him comparable to Spinoza who had as his leading interpreter in this country another Jewish philosopher in the person of Dr. Abraham Wolf of London University.

Law has attracted Jewish students. Among the country's greatest lawyers today, in addition to Lord Cohen, is Professor A. L. Goodhart, the first Jew to become a Master of an Oxford College, University College. The Regius Professor of Civil Law at Oxford is Dr. David Daube who was appointed in place of another Jewish holder of that office, the late Professor Jolowicz. At Cambridge, an outstanding teacher was Professor Hersch Lauterpacht, now a member of the International Court at the Hague.

### Technical education

In these days much stress is laid on technological education, and in this relation one must recall the name of Sir Philip Magnus (1842-1933). Sir Philip, originally a Minister of the West London Synagogue, became in 1880 Director of the City and Guilds of London Institute and devoted his organising ability and great talents to the furtherance of technical education. He was M.P. for London University. Of great importance is the work of another eminent Jew in a field of activity which is becoming of more and more value, Industrial Psychology. The founder of the Institute of Industrial Psychology was Dr. Charles Myers, F.R.S. (d. 1946). Dr. Myers served in both World Wars, and in the last was the leading figure in the institution of those tests which contributed so much to maintaining the morale of the fighting forces, as well as investigating those causes which led from time to time to its decline.

In another sphere of a more prosaic character, though of equal importance to the nation, the name of Redcliffe Salaman, F.R.S. (d. 1955) is outstanding. He, after a short time as a medical practitioner, devoted himself to agricultural science, and became the greatest authority on all aspects of that vital factor of human food, the potato.

As already mentioned, London University included among its founders several prominent Jews, first and foremost being Sir Isaac Lyon Goldsmid. Scholarships and prizes commemorate such names as Goldsmid, Rothschild, Stern, Salamons and Jessel. Outstanding gifts by Jewish citizens for educational purposes include the Beit Foundation for the Study of Colonial History at Oxford, the Institute of Physical Chemistry at Cambridge, which will always be associated with the name of Sir Robert Waley Cohen and the great Library at Liverpool, made possible by a gift of £100,000 from Mr. Harold L. Cohen.

#### **Benefactors in education and industry**

A gift to further the cause of industrial peace was the foundation by Sir Montague Burton, founder of the great tailoring firm, of a Chair for the study of that subject at more than one university.

Harrow, Clifton College, King's College School, Wimbledon, and the City of London School have many scholarships and prizes founded by, or in memory of, Jewish benefactors to commemorate outstanding events in Anglo-Jewish history.

A gift of more than usual interest was the bequest by the second Lord Rothschild, the great zoologist and an F.R.S., of his great Museum at Tring, which was left to the Natural History section of the British Museum. His brother, Charles Rothschild, famous as an entomologist, bequeathed to the nation that entomologist's paradise, part of Wickham Fen in Cambridgeshire.

In the field of charity Jewish names are literally legion. How many people have ever heard of R. S. Zunz, a metal broker who, in 1901, left the residue of his estate, some £200,000, to charitable causes. The trustees carried on the business and the profits were devoted to that purpose and practically every London hospital has today a Zunz ward. The trust was wound up in 1937 when half a million pounds was divided between 34 London hospitals.

The name of Rothschild stands, of course, for something else besides banking. In the London Hospital there are 55 beds and cots



MR. AND MRS. N. M. ROTHSCHILD AND THEIR FAMILY

*By Hobday*

*(From the collection of Messrs. N. M. Rothschild and Sons)*

and 4 wards, all due to Jewish charitable effort, notably the Rothschilds. The Evelina Hospital for Children was founded by Ferdinand de Rothschild in memory of his wife, as was the Children's Hospital in Vincent Square by the late Sir Robert Mond.

A comparatively unknown member of the community, Mr. Alexander Levy of Maidenhead, left in 1942 the residue of his estate, £800,000, to the King Edward's Hospital Fund, a Fund which has so many Jewish supporters who have donated something like a million pounds that the antisemites stupidly called it the Jewish Hospital Fund.

Another Levy, Sir Albert (d. 1937) endowed a Ward at the Royal Free Hospital. He created in 1929 a benevolent fund which will eventually amount to £400,000 for the purpose of assisting hospitals and other charitable causes, and also contributed £50,000 towards

the Eastman Dental Clinic. The Middlesex Hospital recognises as its second founder the late Sir Edward Meyerstein. His donations amounted to £280,000 and the Barnato-Joel families founded the Cancer Wing with a gift of a quarter of a million pounds.

The names of Goldsmid—carrying on an 18th century tradition—and Lucas, are honoured at the University College Hospital for their numerous donations and constant support. Four wards and eighteen beds and cots are named after Jewish donors.

No better illustration of the Jewish belief in the sacredness of universal charity can be found than the example of the late Bernhard Baron (1850-1929) whose inventions revolutionised the tobacco industry. In 1928 he created the Bernhard Baron Trust with £500,000 to be distributed to hospitals and orphanages. He died in the following year, and of the residue of his estate 30% was left to trustees to be distributed in the same manner. The greater number of charities selected were non-Jewish; under the Trust no less than 366 charities have benefited, including institutions for the crippled and the blind. Guy's Hospital owes its new dispensary to a gift of £10,000 from this fund, and the Royal College of Surgeons was able to extend its research laboratories by a gift of £30,000 from the same munificent source.

At Midhurst stands the great sanatorium for the cure of consumption, named after King Edward VII, one of the finest of its kind in the world. It was founded by Sir Edward Cassel (1852-1921) a staunch worker for peace, particularly between his adopted country, England, and the land of his birth, Germany. He founded the Anglo-German foundation to make the one country better known to the other, though his efforts were in vain.

Jewish benefactions are not confined to London. In Liverpool the Great Northern Hospital was refounded by David Lewis. The Epileptic Colony at Alderley Edge, in Cheshire, is another. The Chairman of the Trustees, Benn W. Levy, was also famous for his greathearted benevolence, was an Honorary Freeman of the two great cities of Manchester and Liverpool.

It is well to recall the gift of the late Otto Kahn, of St. Dunstan's Lodge, for the care of heroes blinded in the Great War. Another great gift for the benefit of sufferers from the same affliction was the establishment of the Alfred Eichholz Clinic, founded in memory of a distinguished educationalist, and which was further enriched in 1944 by a legacy of £100,000 from a cousin, William Eichholz.



One member of the community who deserves special mention was Frederic David Mocatta (1828-1905) descended from a "Founding Father" of the Sephardic Community was distinguished for his greathearted benevolence and his support of cultural causes. He was responsible for the Anglo-Jewish Exhibition of 1887, and when he died he left his fortune to be divided equally between Jewish and non-Jewish charities.

### Care of children

The welfare of children and the care of the orphan have always been dear to the heart of the Jew. There is no doubt, in spite of biographical efforts that Dr. Barnardo, "the father of the fatherless," was the son of a German emigrant of Jewish descent. At Stowmarket and Long Eaton stand the Wandsworth Orphanages, founded under the will of Lord Wandsworth (1845-1912) a member of the Stern family. Nearly five hundred children, without distinction of creed, owe to him not only a kindly home but a future livelihood, for they are all, in time, apprenticed or provided with jobs.

No survey would be complete without the Sassoon family, though as is but natural, the chief centre of their generosity was in the East. Sir Albert Sassoon was in 1873 the first Jew to receive the honorary freedom of the City of London in consideration of "his munificence and philanthropic exertions in the causes of charity and the promotion of education, more especially though not exclusively, in our Indian Empire." The Elphinstone High School at Bombay, the Sassoon Infirmary at Poona, the Jacob Sassoon European General Hospital, founded at a cost of nearly two million rupees, and the Central College of Science at Bombay, are some of the foundations due to the generosity of this family. In England, the St. Anne's Wells Gardens at Brighton (the town in which so many members of this family made their home) the Public Hall at Walton-on-Thames, and the Mozelle Sassoon X-Ray Department at the Middlesex Hospital, are further evidences of their broadminded generosity.

### Animal welfare

But the cause of sick humanity does not alone make an appeal to the Jew. Today when there is an agitation against the Jewish method of slaughter, founded on considerable ignorance, we should recall the name of Lewis Gompertz. His whole life was devoted to

the welfare of animals. He was so consistent in his views, that he was not only a vegetarian, but would not eat eggs nor ride in a coach—it was not until 1830 when the railway came into more general use, that he permitted himself to travel. He wrote a pamphlet in 1824 entitled "Moral Enquiries on the situation of man and brutes." The ideas in this pamphlet led to the foundation of what is today the R.S.P.C.A. and of which for a time Gompertz was Hon. Secretary. He found himself, even in a field which one would imagine to be free from intolerance, attacked by people who alleged that he was anti-Christian. This eventually led to his resignation, though he had been not only a moral but a financial pillar of strength to the new Society. In its Centenary History, belated recognition was given to his work, as the following quotation will show:—

"He was loyal to the ancient teachings of his race which had always—according to the civilisation of those early days—cared for animals in their possession, and he gave practical form to the teaching of the ancient Hebrew while adopting his ideas to the requirements of the times in which he lived. Therefore, his memory must ever be held in respect and gratitude as one of those who rendered possible successes which have done so much to make the R.S.P.C.A. a power not only in Great Britain but all over the civilised world."

## Comment

### CROMWELL MEMORIAL SERVICE

Each year a service is held in honour of the memory of Oliver Cromwell in front of his statue outside the Houses of Parliament. In view of the fact that this year the anniversary coincided with the Tercentenary of the Resettlement of Jews in Britain, it was appropriate that a member of the Jewish community was invited to take part in the service on September 3rd and read the first lesson. A note circulated with the order of service referred to Cromwell's advocacy of the return of the Jews to England and made special mention of the Council of Christians and Jews in the following terms: "Its formation may be regarded as a fitting climax to three hundred years of social life shared by Christians and Jews in this country, largely as the result of Cromwell's far-sighted policy of toleration."

## THE "PROTESTANT POPE" BEATIFIED

Lord Acton, in his *Lecture on Modern History*, quotes a seventeenth-century Englishman called Oldmixon who referred to Innocent XI, who was beatified in Rome on October 7th, as "a Protestant Pope." "In France he was spoken of as a Jansenist." Now that his orthodoxy even when not speaking *ex cathedra* has been subjected to the minute and rigorous examination of the Congregation of Rites, and found to be unimpeachable, it is worth while recalling why Innocent should have been called "the Protestant Pope." The answer is, when all the political undergrowth has been cleared away, that he was a model of Christian toleration. Lord Acton, saying that "he endeavoured, as nobody had done since the Reformation, to find a remedy for the divisions of Western Christendom," goes on:

"Innocent sanctioned a scheme of concessions which was deemed satisfactory in the universities of Protestant Germany. When Louis XIV revoked the edict of toleration (the Edict of Nantes), the Pope did not conceal his displeasure. He was compelled at last to allow Te Deums and illuminations; but he made no secret of his disbelief in the armed apostolate of missionaries in jackboots. He was bitterly opposed to the Gallican system, out of which the persecution proceeded."

And Acton goes on to note that "James II was odious to him for many reasons." The Roman Catholic Lord Perth wrote from Rome in 1695: "The Prince of Orange has more friends here than either in England or Holland, and the king is universally hated. It's scandalous to hear what is said every day, publicly, when they make comparisons betwixt an heretical, unnatural, usurping tyrant and His Majesty." So far was this true that the Editor of *The Tablet* a few weeks ago, referred to Innocent XI as "the Orange Pope;" and a Catholic scholar, Sir Gyles Isham, committed himself to the view that: "If James II had followed the Pope's advice, he might have kept his throne and advanced Catholic emancipation by a hundred and thirty years."

## HISTORY WITH BIAS

It is common knowledge that there is a national flavour in history textbooks. Some English and French school histories of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars, for instance, might almost be describing completely unrelated events. But it is more surprising

when we find wide discrepancies occurring within a nation about its own history. The Council of Christians and Jews enquiry into history textbooks revealed that this happened to some extent in English history books, especially when dealing with the Reformation. Now there comes a report of an even more glaring conflict of interpretation from France.

An extraordinary story is told in *Arts* of the different things learnt by the author's two daughters, one of whom is at a State "lay" school and the other at a "confessional" school.

The author describes how he overheard a furious argument in progress between the children, aged nine and ten years, about who was really responsible for the massacre of St. Bartholomew. He took away the history books which had provided them with material for their argument and found that to read them made one's blood run cold. "It was a case of two accounts which only coincided on dates and proper names." For most of the time, he says, the two history books showed a gap as wide as that which separates a leading article in the right-wing Paris newspaper *L'Aurore* from one in the Communist paper *L'Humanité*.

This tendentiousness increased as revolutionary times approached. The church school history book (written by a priest) taught its pupils that Louis XVI was a good but weak king, who wanted only his people's well-being and who died as a Christian martyr. The lay history book (written by a State inspector of primary education) declares that Louis XVI betrayed the French people, that he helped the enemies of France, and that that was why Parisians put him into prison, and the members of the convention later condemned him to death.

The two books differ even in their pictorial treatment. Thus the church school book shows a picture of the Chouans, or Royalist insurgents of the Vendée under the First Republic, attending a secret Mass, the very image of piety and excellence; the lay history book depicts the Chouans as desperate and pirate-like figures in the act of cutting up pieces a small boy. The pictures of the fall of the Bastille show, on the one hand a number of intoxicated brutes walking about with heads on the ends of poles; and on the other, the stormers of the Bastille seem to be taking part in some sort of jolly carnival—the book explains that the Marquis de Launay, the governor of the prison, who was in fact massacred, "was taken prisoner."

The conclusion drawn by the author is that such teaching is a "vast attempt at corruption of young people" and a deliberate effort to prepare further generations for mutual enmity. We may doubt the motives ascribed to the authors of such school histories, but there can be little disagreement about the probable consequences.

### THE CARDINALS RELEASED

As we go to Press we learn with the utmost satisfaction of the release of Cardinal Wyszynski, Primate of Poland. We earnestly hope that his release is a sign of the restoration of religious freedom and liberty of conscience in Poland. The tragedy of Hungary is reflected in the fate of Cardinal Mindszenty, who, according to our latest information, had to seek refuge in the American Embassy in Budapest only a few days after his release from prison.

## About Ourselves

IN THIS ISSUE OF *Common Ground* we print a summary of Professor Herbert Butterfield's lecture "Toleration in British History," the third Robert Waley Cohen Memorial Lecture, delivered before a crowded audience in the Inner Temple Hall on October 9th. The occasion was a notable one. This was the first public lecture to be given in the rebuilt Inner Temple Hall, the earlier Hall having been destroyed during the London blitz. As Sir Seymour Karminski, a Benchler of the Inner Temple, said in moving a vote of thanks to Professor Butterfield, this was perhaps only the first of a great series of lectures which will over the centuries be delivered in the Hall.

The function was presided over by Lord Cohen, a Vice-President of the Council, deputising for the Marquess of Reading who had been ordered to rest. Lord Cohen recalled the debt which the Council owed to Sir Robert Waley Cohen, in whose name the Lectureship was established. The Council's success, he said, was perhaps due more to Sir Robert than to any other single individual.

THE MANCHESTER BRANCH of the Council reports a number of highly successful functions. The evening of Jewish folk stories given by Mr. David Kossoff on September 30th was especially popular. The lunch-time discussions in Manchester have been continued, with a second discussion on divorce, led by Dr. R. W. Wilde, on September 19th. On November 7th Mr. J. M. Allegro is to give a talk on "The Dead Sea Scrolls." Mr. Allegro is one of the team which has been working on the scrolls in Jerusalem, his particular responsibility being the Bible commentaries and some of the "wisdom literature."

The Jewish Tercentenary was celebrated in Manchester at an informal reception on November 9th given by the Manchester, Salford and District Council of Churches. The guests were welcomed by the Bishop of Manchester, supported by the President of the Free Church Federal Council. The Bishop spoke of the great contribution made by Jews to the life and culture of the whole community, and of the close affinities between the Christian and Jewish faiths.



## BOOK NOTES

THE LIVERPOOL COUNCIL of Christians and Jews reports a change in its honorary officers. The Rev. E. J. Arnold, who has been Secretary of the Council for many years, relinquishes his appointment on leaving Liverpool, and the Rev. Dr. M. J. Roberts has been appointed to succeed him. In extending a cordial welcome to Dr. Roberts, *Common Ground* would also like to express sincere appreciation to Mr. Arnold for all he has done for the Council in Liverpool, and to wish him well in his future parish.

ON OCTOBER 24th (after this magazine went to Press) the Hampstead branch, in conjunction with St. Andrew's Church, Frognal, held a public meeting with a Trio Team discussion on "Race, Religion and Colour." The team consisted of Mr. Adezinka Mako, a law student from Nigeria who has recently been called to the Bar, Mr. Ivor Hockman, and Mr. D. Wallace Bell.

## Book Notes

### **The Bible in Art The Old Testament**

(Phaidon Press, 42s.)

For nearly two millenniums the Bible has inspired the imagination of artists. Every picture gallery has its quota of Biblical themes, and every museum its illuminated psalters. But most of us rarely have the chance of visiting the museums and galleries outside our own town or country, and many of the most famous pictures are known to us, if at all, only by repute.

Phaidon Press has here brought together over two hundred reproductions of miniatures, drawings, paintings and sculptures inspired by the Old Testament, and the result is a joy to behold. The catholicity of the selection ranges from third century catacomb reliefs—probably the earliest form of Christian art—to Tiepolo (18th century), with, naturally, a predominance of Old Masters. One is more than compensated for some notable omissions from the London galleries by the many paintings that one had never previously seen, even in reproduction, from galleries as far apart as Leningrad and Washington.

The arrangement of the book follows the chapters of the Old

Testament, from the story of the Creation to the Prophets, and the admirable notes by Heidi Heimann relate each plate to its Biblical setting, and add to our enjoyment by drawing attention to some of the less obvious features of the pictures which otherwise one might miss.

An introduction by Marcel Brion traces the development of Biblical art from the strict Old Testament injunction against imagery through the impact of Greek influences on early Christianity, to the great resurgence of art at the Renaissance. Brion's attempts at theological interpretation will not all go unchallenged, nor will some of his comments on the inspiration of later artists by Biblical subjects. One readily agrees that in the books of the Old Testament "the entire story of the human race is told in word-pictures," but surely it was not just that Bible subjects were more picturesque and dramatic than the Greek legends that led to their predominance in European art. There was also the influence of a Christian environment, and of patronage, which Brion does not even mention. Nor, M. Brion, is it "over two thousand years ago" that Christianity first adopted the Old Testament.

*contd. on page 32*

## *Meetings to which you are invited*

---

Readers of *Common Ground* may be interested to note dates of meetings arranged by Local Councils during the coming months. The list below is not necessarily complete, but is compiled from the programmes we have received from Local Council secretaries. Readers and their friends will be welcome at any of these meetings

### LONDON

#### THE LONDON SOCIETY OF JEWS AND CHRISTIANS

A series of public meetings to be held at Kings Weigh House, Church Hall, Binney Street, Oxford Street, London, W.1 at 8.15 p.m.

Thursday, October 25th. "Personal Prayer in Judaism and Christianity"

The Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Woolwich.

The Rev. Dr. Chaim Pearl, M.A., Ph.D.

Wednesday, December 12th. "Ceremonies in Judaism and Christianity"

Rabbi C. E. Cassell.

The Rev. Canon Marcus Knight, B.D., F.K.C.

Tuesday, January 22nd. "Public Worship in Judaism and Christianity"

The Rev. John Huxtable, M.A.

The Rev. John D. Rayner, M.A.

Wednesday, March 27th. "Jewish and Christian Views on the History of Mankind"

Dr. Hans Liebeschuetz, Ph.D., M.A.

The Rev. Canon Edward Carpenter.

Thursday, April 11th. "Jewish and Christian Views of the Destiny of Mankind"

The Rev. T. F. Glasson, M.A., D.D.

Dr. Erwin Rosenthal, D.Phil., M.A.

Thursday, May 16th (evening). Conducted tour of St. Paul's Cathedral by the Dean of St. Paul's and of Bevis Marks Synagogue by the Very Rev. Dr. Gaon, the Haham.

## WILLESDEN

### COUNCIL OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS (WILLESDEN BRANCH)

3rd October, 8 p.m.	Social Evening
11th December, 8 p.m. "The Church of England Today"	
Rev. Michael Dean (Rural Dean of Willesden)	
3rd January	Film Evening
6th March	Dance
11th April	Annual General Meeting

---

## HULL

### COUNCIL OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS (HULL BRANCH)

12th November, 7.30 p.m.	Annual General Meeting
Speaker: Professor Brynmor Jones, Vice-Chancellor of Hull University	

---

## LEEDS

### COUNCIL OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS (LEEDS BRANCH)

26th November	Public Meeting
To be addressed by His Grace the Lord Archbishop of York.	

---

## CARDIFF

### COUNCIL OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS (CARDIFF BRANCH)

Monthly meetings to be held in the Friends Meeting House, Charles Street, Cardiff, on Mondays at 7.30 p.m.

5th November, Rev. W. W. Simpson.

3rd December, Rev. Cassam

7th January, American Consul in Cardiff.

4th February, Mr. Arnold (Temple of Peace).

4th March, Mr. A. I. Polack.

8th April } Speakers to be arranged.  
6th May }

**The Bible in Art—contd. from page 29**

But the book itself is a masterpiece. It should be loaned to one's friends with great caution, lest the temptation be too great! As for the quality of the reproductions, both in monochrome and in full colour, it is sufficient to say that this is a Phaidon Press production. We look forward to a companion volume on the New Testament.

**The New Testament  
and Rabbinic Judaism**

*By David Daube  
(The Athlone Press, 45s.)*

The present book, an enlarged version of a series of lectures and articles previously published in periodicals, has something for both Christians and Jews. Professor Daube who, beside his legal academic profession, combines profound knowledge of rabbinical literature with an interest in the New Testament, compares various "motifs" and "ideas" from the latter with what he considers to be their counterparts in rabbinical writings. It is a fascinating attempt at re-drawing the picture of Palestinian Judaism in the time of Jesus and his followers.

Daube does not enter the argument of how the books that have been collected in the N.T. originated, nor does he distinguish between component parts of these books, but he draws the reader's attention to various *typoi* and *topoi* in the Old Testament that have some similarity with certain descriptions and situations in various parts of the N.T. He then proceeds to give the rabbinical interpretation of the O.T. passages in question. Commendable is the attempt to differentiate between the religious and intellectual outlook of Palestinian Judaism in the time of Jesus and between later developments within Judaism. Here Daube is sometimes at his best and his observations on the complex character of Jewish beliefs in the era of the New Testament will contribute to a better and more correct appreciation of Jewish thought in Jesus' time.

*Through lack of space, other Book Notes  
are held over to our next issue.*

**CHRISTMAS CARDS**

from the Ivory Sculpture

**"JESUS AND HIS MAMMY"**

by

**NAMBA ROY**

*(as printed in the July 1956 issue  
of "Common Ground")*

**Price, with envelopes,  
5s. 6d. per dozen  
(including postage)**

from

**CAPRICORN CARVINGS**

Grovelands, The Grove,  
Horley, Surrey

